

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IV, No. 20

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

Nov. 15, 1974

New Federal Energy "Blueprint" Compounds the Confusion

Bearing an introduction by John C. Sawhill, the most recently ousted top official in the federal energy hierarchy, now arrives *Project Independence Report* to further enrich the chaos that has settled upon government energy planning.

In the works since March, the 1000-page report drew upon the services of "over 500 professionals" and was originally described as a definitive blueprint that would help set a course for the nation's energy efforts, particularly in research and development. But, as Sawhill states in the preface, "This report does not recommend specific policy actions," nor does it do much else, beyond rehashing the plethora of energy documentation that was inspired by last

year's Arab oil embargo. Coming just a year after Richard Nixon surprised even his own advisers by announcing that energy self-sufficiency would be achieved by 1980 with the help of a massive infusion of research and development funds, the report concludes that R & D, in fact, will have little impact on energy supply during the next 10 years.

Rather, the message is that energy prices will largely shape supply and demand in the next 10 years, and R & D will not begin to pay off before 1985. For the many scarred veterans of abrupt shifts and twists of federal R & D policies, the ominous message is that the people who are

(Continued on page 2)

Cancer Bd. Urges Tobacco Curb

The latest round in the 10-year minuet between government and cigarettes will take place next week when the National Cancer Advisory Board will receive a report from a subcommittee that it assigned to look into President Ford's request for an assessment of the scientific case against cigarette smoking.

The President's request was prompted by the Board's latest annual report, which cited cigarette smoking as "the most remediable cause of cancer deaths in the United States—and the one which seems hardest to change." Calling for action by Congress to ban all cigarette advertising and to prohibit interstate commerce in cigarettes with high tar and nicotine content, the Board obviously created a dilemma for a President who isn't looking for trouble.

Ford's response, addressed to Jonathan E. Rhoads, chairman of the Board, was cautiously statesmanlike. The report, he noted, "does not provide an assessment of the scientific evidence at hand which should provide the basis for such regulation.

"...I would like to request that the National Cancer Advisory Board review the existing scientific evidence on an urgent basis and provide me with an assessment of the extent to which there exists a scientific basis for responsible regulation of cigarettes."

Ford added that "I recognize that all questions of regulation necessarily involve a certain amount of reasonable judgment. Nevertheless, it is critically important that our judgments be soundly based so that we may proceed with the greatest amount of wisdom."

In Brief

Yielding to warnings of the inevitability of serious attempts to hijack nuclear materials, the AEC is proposing new security regulations that rely heavily on armed guards. Whereas none is now required on air and sea shipments of "significant quantities"—5 kilograms and over—the proposed regulations call for two armed guards; rail shipments, now requiring two guards, will have to be accompanied by five, and shipments on open railroad cars may not weigh less than 5000 pounds.

President Ford's proposal Oct. 29 at Ohio State for "a great new partnership of labor and academia" has spawned 10 task forces drawn from HEW, the Labor and Commerce Departments, as well as a good deal of high-vacuum oratory from US Education Commissioner T. H. Bell, who has called for the creation of Community Work and Education Councils "to ensure that working people on every level take an active part in interpreting their work role to students and that youngsters have choices in trying out the kinds of jobs available in their community."

A new page-charge policy adopted by the Federal Council for Science and Technology—and applicable to all federal agencies—specifies that publication costs can be charged to the funds of an agency if it supported the research that's being reported, and if the charges are applied impartially to government and non-government organizations.

Those trumpet calls for a big boost in coal production are a source of pained amusement for the nation's mining schools, which have declined in number from 34 to 20 over the past 20 years. Mining studies, in fact, sank so low in job potential and prestige, that in 1971 only 138 bachelor's degrees were awarded in mining engineering.

Energy (Continued) : Quick R&D Payoff Discounted

supposedly in charge as of this moment, really don't have much of an idea as to where they're heading; nor is there any assurance that they will be on hand very long to find out.

Apart from the newly issued report, evidence of at least some caution about the potential of research was expressed by Alvin Weinberg, the head of the Federal Energy Administration's R & D Policy Office, who said that "we shouldn't give the American public the impression that R & D could solve the energy crisis in five years. There was a stage in the Project Independence deliberations when R & D was touted as the solution, but that isn't the case."

Weinberg's remarks were made at a meeting of the Energy R & D Advisory Council, the nation's top research advisory committee, which was meeting at the National Science Foundation while copies of the report were rolling off the presses.

Although the "blueprint" explicitly states that it doesn't attempt "to lay out a detailed federal energy R & D program," it states that government involvement in energy R & D is "hardly an issue" since market forces can't be expected to produce sufficient commercial investment in long-term technologies.

Over the short term, the report states, R & D may help to improve the efficiency of oil and gas recovery, and that "greater use of coal will require R & D to solve environmental problems related to its extraction and consumption. Similarly, growing use of nuclear power may be jeopardized unless R & D can resolve the remaining issues of safety and the fuel cycle."

However, the lack of recommendations on what kinds of research should be undertaken and on what should get

priority, makes the document less than useful as a guide for laboratory administrators who need to know what the future holds.

The report blandly states, for example, that "the long-range energy supply analysis implies that several new supply technologies will be needed in the post-1985 period." It also makes the point that after 1985, domestic reserves of oil and gas will dwindle and the cost of getting them out of the ground will increase, so that "synthetics from coal and shale oil will be particularly critical," as will "New sources of electric power not dependent on limited supplies of fossil fuel or uranium."

But even assuming that a concentrated effort is put into energy conservation, the report estimates that 8-million barrels of synthetics will have to be produced from coal and shale oil by the year 2010 to meet the demand for liquid fuels. If energy consumption is not checked, the figure would reach 25-million barrels.

It notes, however, that the recovery of oil from shale will run into severe environmental problems and will also be limited by shortages of water, thus "the demand will fall disproportionately on coal." The "primary policy issue," the report states, "is not whether to produce synthetics, but when to build demonstration plants using existing technologies so we can learn more about large-scale coal conversion." It helpfully adds that the decision will be based on a variety of factors.

On oil shale technology, the report suggests that the *in situ* method is worth examining since it seems to get around some of the environmental problems and it

(Continued on page 3)

Teller Attacks High Priority for Fusion Research Projects

Edward Teller, the nuclear scientist who is commonly referred to as the "father" of the US H-bomb, has been voicing doubts lately about the prospects of getting electric power from fusion reactors. Last week he successfully urged the Energy R & D Advisory Council to take the position that fusion research is being overfed with government money, and at a meeting in Stanford on October 31, he took out after those who have been arguing that lasers will be the key to fusion power in the near future.

"I believe (laser fusion) will not produce any energy in this generation or the next," he said, "It won't help us with this energy crisis or even the next one. It may help us with the one after that."

Recent research results coming out of a number of institutions, particularly the University of Michigan,

have led to claims that laser fusion may be closer to commercial application than some alternative approaches. But Teller pointed out to his Stanford audience that nobody has yet developed the kind of laser that will be needed for the job, and that some fundamental scientific advances in understanding the behavior of matter under the extraordinary conditions in a fusion reactor will be necessary before "there will be any hope for a practical result."

Although he acknowledges that his pessimism isn't shared by many of his colleagues in fusion research, Teller tried to get the Energy R & D Advisory Council to sound a cautionary note explicitly on the prospects for laser fusion, but when nobody else went along with the suggestion, he settled for a warning that funding for the entire fusion effort shouldn't grow too fast.

Scientists, Engineers Seen in Short Supply for Energy Growth

Any plan to step up production of energy from domestic resources to meet the Nixon goal of energy self-sufficiency would probably be derailed by a severe shortage of scientists and engineers, according to projections developed by the National Planning Association (NPA).

Although manpower forecasting is often akin to reading tea leaves, the NPA is generally regarded as one of the better diviners of manpower trends. Its study of energy R & D demands, which was performed for the National Science Foundation, is therefore of more than passing interest.

Starting from the assumption that domestic energy supply will more than double between 1970 and 1985, the NPA study estimates that the energy industry will require nearly 230,000 scientists and engineers by 1980, and 307,000 by 1985. By comparison, the energy industry employed 141,000 in 1970.

Taking into account losses of scientists and engineers by attrition, the study estimates that the annual demand for engineers in energy-related industries will reach 9,200 by 1980 and increase to about 14,600 by 1985. The corresponding projections for scientists are 3,000 by 1980 and 5,500 by 1985. But, with enrollments in university science and engineering departments dropping, those numbers may not be available.

The Office of Education estimates, for example, that

about 34,000 people are now graduating each year with engineering degrees, but declining enrollments will depress the output to 28,000 by 1985 if the trend isn't reversed. Nearly half of each year's output from the engineering schools will therefore be required by the energy industry in ten years' time. In 1970, however, only 10 percent of the nation's engineers were employed in energy-related jobs.

The NPA also points out that "this bleak future supply/demand relationship for the scientists and engineers required for energy production is further complicated by the fact that, in most cases, *experienced* scientists and engineers and/or those with skills beyond the bachelor's degrees are needed."

With the recent experience of massive layoffs in the aerospace industry as a reminder of the durability of national commitments to crash programs, it's unlikely that sufficient numbers of high school students will be attracted to study science and engineering on the grounds of secure job prospects.

The study therefore predicts that "the future supply of engineers and scientists may be inadequate to meet the demands of activities designed to increase domestic energy supplies."

Summaries of the report are available from the National Planning Association, 1606 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20009, for \$1.

ENERGY (Continued from page 2)

also may not be subject to the same water limitations. Again, "the issue is mainly one of timing."

Then on to discussion of the breeder reactor, the Administration's most heavily funded and troubled energy R & D effort. Since major shifts to electric power production are likely to take place after 1985, the report predicts that "there will be an urgent need for new electric generation technology such as the breeder," but the "Major policy issues involve the pace of the program and management of the demonstration project."

On fusion, the report comes close to offering a recommendation. It implies that since fusion power is desirable, "the program should be aggressively pursued," but it then adds that "there is a question about its rate of growth in the near term."

As for solar power, the report states that solar R & D has received little funding so far, and that more effort should be spent on solar electricity generation "to pin down its cost so that educated choices can be made."

And so it goes on, with one bland statement after another. But, in comparison with the meeting of the Energy R & D Advisory Council, the Project Independence

Blueprint is a model of clarity and decisiveness.

The Council, which was appointed by Nixon late last year to advise the government on energy policy, indulged in several hours of aimless discussion, the stated objective of which was to make some recommendations to the Office of Management and Budget on priorities for next year's energy R & D budget. But perhaps the most significant fact to emerge was that members of the Council completely failed to reach agreement on whether or not the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) should be accorded the top priority in the energy R & D strategy.

The discussion on priorities started with a rambling discourse on whether or not R & D could have any short-term impact on energy conservation. After discussing the fact that 40% of new homes built in the United States now are mobile homes—a point made by nuclear physicist Edward Teller—NSF Director H. Guyford Stever, who was chairing one session, summed up by saying that it was the sense of the Council that additional resources could usefully be allocated to conservation R & D. Nobody disagreed.

On oil and gas technologies, the Council declared its support for more research into the *in situ* method of

(Continued on page 4)

FDA Inquiry into Favoritism Remains Stalled

HEW's promise of an open-door, far-reaching inquiry into allegations of industry favoritism at the Food and Drug Administration (SGR Vol. IV, No. 16) has dissolved amidst charges of conflict of interest on the part of the study group head and has, at least in part, been succeeded by a rhetorical counterattack by FDA Commissioner Alexander M. Schmidt.

The study was announced last August after a group of FDA employees and consultants told a hearing chaired by Senator Edward M. Kennedy that their decisions to approve drugs were routinely accepted without quibble by their

ENERGY *(Continued from page 3)*

extracting oil from shale, and for an overall increase in governmental support for drilling technology and more efficient recovery from existing wells.

As for coal reasearch, last year, the Council took credit for getting a massive, last-minute increase in the FY 1975 budget for the Office of Coal Research, and it continued its support last week. The Council suggested, however, that greater emphasis should be placed on extraction technology, but some disagreement developed when Teller, in a minority of one, suggested that the funding for the synthetic fuels program should be decreased because of environmental problems, and that more effort should be placed on coal gas conversion technologies.

The Council declared itself strongly behind research on fusion as a long-term option, but questioned the funding levels now being proposed. Teller in particular states that they are too high, and the Council eventually adopted the position that fusion research shouldn't be allowed to grow too rapidly.

Finally, on the breeder, recent cost estimates which show the LMFBR demonstration plant is already 150% above the original cost estimates and three years behind schedule created a sharp difference of opinion.

Simon Ramo, of TRW, said that since the LMFBR has failed to capture a strong majority of professional opinion in its favor, the program should proceed at a slower pace. Teller added that there's not enough proof that the demonstration breeder plant will produce sufficient data to justify its construction, and he suggested moderation. Others, however, led by Manson Benedict of MIT and Louis Roddis of Consolidated Edison, argued that the potential for the program is too great to be cut back at this stage.

Stever eventually told members of OMB who were present that the Council "flunked the breeder test"—which should be a great help for OMB's planning of the 1976 energy budget.—CN

(Copies of Project Independence Report are available for \$8.35 from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.)

FDA superiors, but that their negative decisions were often overturned and frequently followed by reprimands and re-assignments to irrelevant tasks.

Following that testimony, HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger announced that the charges would be aired before a panel presided over by Theodore H. Cooper, deputy assistant to Assistant Secretary for Health Charles C. Edwards. Cooper, however, dropped out when the protesting group complained that his boss, Edwards, had held the post of FDA Commissioner when many of the alleged episodes took place. His departure from the assignment was supported by Kennedy, who charged that the arrangement amounted to FDA investigating FDA. Since then, the organization of the investigation has been entrusted to the Office of General Counsel at HEW, but according to HEW sources, nothing much has been done to get on with the inquiry.

Meanwhile, Schmidt has taken to lecture circuit to assail Kennedy's unflattering perceptions of the FDA. For example, in a talk last month to the National Association of Retail Druggists, the FDA Commissioner said that "Congressional critics must present the issues fairly," and he recommended that they "not stoop to making political gains." He also said that it is "harder and harder to avoid suspicions" that parties on both sides of the debate possess "less than noble motivations."

Kennedy, who chairs the health subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, plans to take up the subject again at hearings scheduled for Dec. 5-6.

New NIH Research Risks Office

An Office for Protection from Research Risks has been established in the Office of the director and deputy director of the National Institutes of Health to deal with the variety of new regulations governing human and animal experimentation. The Office, to be headed by Donald Chalkley, inherits the duties of the recently abolished Institutional Relations Branch of the Division of Research Grants. It will provide guidance on experimentation regulations and will coordinate policy development.

Hughes Appointed to NSF Post

Robert Hughes, a chemistry professor at Cornell University, has been nominated Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation for National and International Programs, to fill the vacancy left by the resignation in July of Thomas B. Owens. Hughes has been working as a senior policy analyst in NSF's Science and Technology Policy Office for the past couple of months.

Academy President's Food Crisis Speech Gets Rehashed

The numerous public addresses of Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, are usually available for the asking, but, in Orwellian fashion, one of his recent productions has been withdrawn from circulation.

Titled, "On the State of Man," and delivered Sept. 29 to the Annual Convocation of Markle Scholars, the gloom-ridden speech, according to Academy staff members, is being extensively rewritten. In the meantime, no more copies of the original text are to be distributed. SGR, however, received a copy before the embargo was declared.

The origin of the revisionist spirit appears to be two-fold:

First, the text conveys an extremely pessimistic perception of the world food crisis, and though the speaker's words permit a variety of interpretations, prominent among them is the possibility that he has adopted a let-'em-starve attitude. In fact, he has not, but in various extemporaneous recyclings of the speech (particularly one before the MIT Corporation this fall)

Handler has left that impression with some members of his audience.

Second, is the matter of some deficiency of classical erudition. Both in the text and in speaking from notes, Handler, to demonstrate his fears of catastrophe, has stated that unless a remedy is found for the world food and population problems, "then it may be wiser to 'let nature take its course' as Aristotle described it: 'From time to time it is necessary that pestilence, famine, and war prune the luxuriant growth of the human race.'"

Following requests for a reference to that gloomy quotation, an Academy spokesman says that it has now been traced, not to Aristotle, but to the 30th chapter of Tertullian's *De Anima*.

According to an Academy source, the Markle text is "no longer available." In anticipation of requests for Handler's views on the world food crisis, a process of "refinement" has been applied to a speech that he delivered October 11 in Tokyo, and those who inquire will be rewarded with that text.

India Restricts Attendance at Research Conference

The Indian government is the latest to adopt the tactic of making it impossible for scientists from "unfriendly" countries to attend international meetings.

Last month, visas were refused to scientists from Israel, Taiwan, Portugal, South Africa, and Rhodesia who wanted to attend the International Congress of Physiological Sciences in New Delhi. Eventually, however, the Indian government relented under pressure and provided the Israelis with 21-day landing permits, but the rest were barred from attending.

The particulars of the matter are as follows. Before New Delhi was chosen as the site of this year's congress, the International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS), which organized the meeting, received an assurance from the Indian government that nobody would be prevented from attending on the basis of religion, race, political philosophy, ethnic origin, language, or sex. But late this summer it became known that scientists from those five countries would be excluded.

Israelis were presumably unwelcome because India didn't want to upset Arab oil suppliers; the Taiwanese because of Taiwan's ouster from the UN; the Portuguese because of the treatment of Indians in Portugal's African colonies, and the Rhodesians and South Africans for obvious reasons.

When news of the matter reached the US National Committee for IUPS, which is housed in the National Academy of Sciences, it was called to the attention of the

International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), and the Academy's Foreign Secretary was asked to negotiate with the Indian Embassy in Washington to rectify the situation.

At a meeting in September, the ICSU General Assembly, though refusing to recommend a boycott of the New Delhi congress, passed a resolution which warned that ICSU would advise its constituent organizations not to plan conferences in countries which repeatedly erect barriers to the free flow of scientific communication. A delegation of Indian physiologists also met with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to protest the denial of visas.

Israelis were eventually allowed to attend (it would in fact have been ironic if they were excluded, since three symposia associated with the Congress were held in Israel) and it turned out that no scientists from Portugal or Rhodesia were registered. The only South African registered had a British passport, which would have allowed him to enter India, but he elected to stay away when his wife was refused a visa. Five Taiwanese were simply denied entry.

Those events prompted John M. Brookhart, the chairman of the US National Committee for IUPS, to send a memo to American scientists planning to attend informing them of what had happened and hoping that they would be able "to make an informed decision about (their) own participation in the New Delhi Congress." About 400 scientists from the US attended.

Oak Ridge Laboratory Staff Seeking Union-Type Association

Employees at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) are in the process of setting up a staff organization which, according to one of its sponsors, is an attempt to give the staff some say in ORNL policy and to lift the "disastrously low morale" at the laboratory. Although it sounds like a union, its supporters are careful not to describe it as such.

An AEC-funded institution managed under contract by Union Carbide, ORNL is engaged in research on weapons, energy, basic biology, and environmental problems.

The root of the troubles are difficult to pin down, but one scientist told SGR that general malaise set in during the fiscally austere times that preceded the present energy spending boom. Another ORNL staff member said that although Union Carbide is "by-and-large not a bad company to work for, policy decisions are made without consultation with the staff. Layoffs occur without discussion, and the management does just what it pleases."

Ironically, the chief impetus for the staff organization came from the management itself. Last year, Union Carbide conducted an attitude survey among ORNL staff members which turned up evidence of widespread

malaise in the place. "People then realized that they were not alone in their feelings," and a group of scientists got together to discuss what they could do about it. The upshot was a letter circulated to 2,000 ORNL staff members at the end of September.

The letter proposed the establishment of a staff association to "seek more positive solutions to the problems of staff morale. . . and an improved reputation for ORNL in research excellence and concern for its staff." The letter went on to suggest that the association would "insure the necessary support from the staff to provide the individual employee with the confidence to express freely his or her opinions," and it said that the association's chief aim would be to establish "a constructive dialogue between the management and staff."

Signed by 1112 ORNL employees, the letter drew expressions of interest from another 200 staff members. A committee was then set up to draw up by-laws, which will be completed in the next few weeks and a membership campaign will begin.

For its part, the management at ORNL has recently opened up some formal and informal channels whereby staff concerns can be aired, and it is adopting a wait-and-see attitude to the proposed association.

News Notes: OTA Oceans Contract, AAAS Appointment

The next big project to be announced by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) is an off-shore oceans study, and, according to SGR sources, the leading contender for the \$500,000-\$700,000 contract is a Vienna, Va. consulting firm, Braddock, Dunn & McDonald, Inc. With the final decision yet to be made, also in the running are Booz Allen & Hamilton, Inc., and the Center for Environmental Studies, Princeton University.

The study, one of the biggest to be sponsored by OTA, will examine the environmental impacts of off-shore drilling, off-shore nuclear powerplants, and deep-water ports.

William D. Carey, one of the shrewder observers of science policy affairs and a former top official in the Bureau of the Budget, has been appointed executive director of the financially troubled American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

His appointment, which has drawn some surprise—not because the job was offered to him but because he accepted it—culminated an intensive search by the elders of the AAAS for a replacement for William Bevan, who

resigned in June to join the psychology department at Duke University.

An official of the Bureau of the Budget for 27 years, and its most senior career bureaucrat for ten of them, Carey is now vice President of Arthur D. Little Inc. He will join the AAAS on January 1.

His experience in dealing with budgetary matters should stand him in good stead at the AAAS. It came to light this summer that the AAAS is in financial trouble, following a deficit of \$370,000 last year and some steep cost increases this year. *Science* Editor Philip Abelson, who took over as acting executive officer when Bevan departed, has already taken some cost-saving measures (SGR Vol. IV, No. 17), but it's clear that Carey will have to use a strong hand to put the AAAS back into the black.

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT, © 1974 by Science & Government Report, Inc. All rights reserved. Daniel S. Greenberg, Editor and Publisher; Colin Norman, Contributing Editor; Margot Daffron, Circulation Manager. Published 22 per year at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015. Subscription rate, \$58 a year; overseas airmail subscription, \$68. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Vol. IV, No. 20, Nov. 15, 1974.

Some Other Things that Nixon Told the Milk Producers

It is well-established that the dairy industry got a federal price-support boost in return for contributing money for the re-election of Richard M. Nixon. What is not so well known is that Mr. Nixon also bestowed upon the industry a bit of sales advice, namely, that it could cut into the sleeping potion trade by promoting milk as a sedative.

This advice, interspersed with presidential ruminations on cholesterol and other matters, was delivered in Mar. 1971 when Harold S. Nelson, general manager of Associated Milk Producers, Inc., met with the President to discuss price supports. As revealed in transcripts of tapes recently published by the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, the conversation went as follows:

President. . . I don't know what can be done about it, but the medical profession don't really know much about cholesterol. . . I mean that's—if you fix a glass of milk and have a heart attack; well, I can think of a lot of other things that's going to give you a heart attack. A lot sooner, too.

(Laughter.)

President. But, uh, incidentally, I, uh, do happen to drink a lot of milk. Well, but, uh, uh,—what, what's the medical profession doing in that respect?

Nelson. Uh.

President. There is cholesterol that goes up and down, you know. They say, "No eggs, no milk, no (unintelligible)." . . . They're not sure.

Unidentified. Yes.

President. Cholesterol, as you know, is related to stress, it's related to—you, you'll have to test make one, uh, one week, or uh, above normal, and next week, uh (unintelligible) be below, which, uh, uh, maybe you were drinking the things that were, other people drink here, uh—

(Laughter.)

Nelson. We've had some breakthroughs on research in the last six months. It, uh,—for the first time it appears to be, uh, uh, favorable (unintelligible) reports and so on. And I've just formed a new organization that has, uh, widespread support among the producer organizations, that is, uh, providing research money. And we're talking about basic research, pure research, uh, for the first time, which we—*

President. You are?

Nelson. Yes sir, yes sir, yes sir; we are. For pure research. And, uh, we feel that this can't help but, uh,

(unintelligible) and good results.

President. You've got one point. It's simply not to get into your business at all, but, uh, in your promotion, every—everybody is going for gimmicks these days, you know.

Nelson. Yes, sir.

President. Take sleep inducers. Now, uh, uh, an article in

Reader's Digest a couple of months ago in regard to sleeping pills—tremendous (?) use of them—but, but almost any, any, uh, person who really studies sleep will tell you probably that, that lacking a sleeping pill—I mean which some, which has side effects, which many times are not (unintelligible)—the best thing you can do is milk. Any kind of thing, you can just, just a glass of milk. You don't have to talk with it or anything like that. It could be warm, it could be, uh, tepid, or it could be cold, but it has a certain soothing effect. Uh, you get people started on that. . . And that's my marketing picture.

(Laughter.)

Unidentified. It didn't help sleep yesterday.

President. I already got that. (Laughter.) Look, but let me tell you that the sleep problem is, of course, the it's, uh, it's, uh, an American psychosis at the moment. In all advanced societies, over 50 percent of the American people that are adults, uh, at this time take some form of sedative. Uh, now, here's, here, here's the mountain. You can go to work all the time, maybe—if some—sometimes you've just got so many problems you're not going to sleep. But that's all psychological, too. If you get people thinking that a glass of milk is going to make them sleep, I mean it'll do just as well as a sleeping pill. It's all in the head.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

- ☐ Renew my subscription
☐ Enter my subscription

for one year, \$58 ☐; two years, \$110 ☐
(Overseas airmail, \$10 additional per year.)

- ☐ check enclosed; ☐ please bill.
☐ Send a complimentary copy to:

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

* SGR Ed. Note: This was apparently an over-enthusiastic reference to a series of projects grants—totaling \$300,000—that Dairy Research, Inc., initiated in 1972 to support basic research related to milk products and nutrition. The projects, conducted by academic researchers, are awarded through the usual filtration system of an independent advisory board, and are yet to cause any major change in the orthodox medical position on cholesterol and health.

After Senate Passage, Kennedy's S. 32 is Becalmed

Senator Kennedy probably set a record for legislative speed in winning Senate approval for his science-policy bill, S. 32, which went through committee and the full chamber in two days (SGR Vol. IV, No. 18). But now that that *tour de force* has been entered into the record, it is plain that neither the House nor the Administration is eager to go along with the measure, a principal feature of which provides for establishing a White House science advisory organization.

President Ford is known to be mildly interested in the various agitations for him to undo his predecessor's abolition of the White House science office. He has discussed the matter with his science adviser, H. Guyford Stever, who is not unhappy with the present setup, which locates White House science advice in the Office of the National Science Foundation director, a position occupied by H. Guyford Stever.

Meanwhile, the House Science and Astronautics Committee, which would handle S. 32, is showing no sign of being especially interested in the matter. When an earlier version of the Kennedy bill (one, however, which lacked the White House advisory section) passed the Senate in 1972, the House didn't even get around to holding hearings. Science and Astronautics, however, is much concerned with the issue of White House science advice, but is only partially through a leisurely series of hearings on the subject. The consensus in the Committee is that, while the President can be urged to equip himself with a fulltime science adviser, he cannot be compelled to make use of one that has been foisted on him by Congress. Therefore, the House Committee continues to take its time and doesn't plan to return to the subject until Congress reassembles next year.

Kennedy's motive for moving so quickly continues to evoke speculation, but the reason remains unclear. According to some of his staff people, he hoped to spur Ford into some action by demonstrating that the Senate is concerned about the matter. Less sympathetic sources say the Senator chose an opportunity to demonstrate that he makes things move when he wants to. In any case, S. 32 is becalmed.

Meanwhile, the Federation of American Scientists has launched a massive mail survey to gather the views of members of the scientific community on what kind of Presidential science advisory apparatus they favor.

A letter, sent out last month, lists three possible options which the Federation says are "in the air," and briefly sets out the pros and cons of each. They are a three-man Council on Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, a Cabinet-level Department of Science and Technology, and an Office of Research and Engineering Management which would not only advise the President on science and technology policy but would also draw up an overall science and technology budget which it would then negotiate with the Office of Management and Budget.

"It is evident that President Ford is giving serious consideration to some sort of White House level role for science," the FAS says, and the letter points out that whatever he decides, Congress will have to discuss it. "We have therefore launched this mass mailing to solicit your views," the FAS says, and it promises to make the results known to the President and other interested parties.

The survey is coupled with a solicitation for funds, for the letter points out that "frankly, unless a certain fraction of new memberships results from this mailing, we can not afford this very expensive consultation with many tens of thousands of scientists."

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D. C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

